UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Armistice Number

VOLUME CXVIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, November 2, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 86

ARTICLES—
Selected—*Xenophon* 83
Peace and War Legislation in the Seventy-Fourth Congress—JESSE M. MACKNIGHT 86
The Unpeaceful Pacific—DOROTHY WALTON BINDER 90
A United Effort to Avert Suicide—KIRBY PAGE 92
Peace Campaigning in Kentucky—ALAN JENKINS 93
Dragon's Teeth—O. A. HAMMAND 95
War: A Neurosis on the National Scale—PAUL PLUMMER SWETT 97
Necessity of an American-Japanese Understanding for Peace in the Pacific—TARAKNATH DAS 98

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Broken Toys—NOUREDDIN ADDIS 96
Armistice Day—MARY E. ERWIN 96
West Point War Drill—MARY OWEN LEWIS 96
No More War—LEONORA HUTCHINSON 96

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Fighter for Peace—JESSIE ROWE RYBURN 99

CORRESPONDENCE—
Militant Braggadocios—S. O. LEVINSON 99
UNITY and Miss Wentworth—R. 99
Peace Poem Contest—WESTERN POETRY LEAGUE 100
Quotation from G. K. Chesterton—J. W. WHITFORD 100

THE FIELD—
A Program for Government Action—*World Events* 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Program for Government Action

"Our government can get us into war or keep us out of war, depending on the policies it pursues. Decisions made by the next Congress will point the way we are to go." With these words, the Emergency Peace Campaign, 20 South 12th St., Philadelphia, Pa., has put forward a carefully considered program to guide the forces working for peace this fall and winter. The program follows:

I. Neutrality

Stronger neutrality legislation providing for mandatory embargoes on munitions, loans, credit, and essential materials of warfare to belligerents when war breaks out in any area.

There is a general consensus of opinion among peace groups that far stronger neutrality legislation should be enacted at once. It is not enough to place embargoes on only munitions and credit to warring nations. Raw materials are essential sinews of war.

The Emergency Peace Campaign, while recognizing that there is a difference of opinion at this point, favors mandatory legislation because the present permissive bill vests in the President an indirect war-making power which constitutionally belongs to Congress, because mandatory embargoes would relieve the pressure of special sections and interests upon the government in a crisis, and because under mandatory neutrality the imposition of embargoes could not be construed as an unfriendly act to any nation.

II. Military and Naval Policy

(A) Revision by the U. S. government of its military and naval policy so that it will be restricted to the protection of continental United States against invasion, as a first step toward universal total disarmament.

(B) We oppose the "fundamental policy" of our navy department as officially announced, of "maintaining a navy in sufficient strength to defend our interests, commerce, and overseas possessions." We also oppose such manifestations of this policy as more battleship construction and provocative naval demonstrations.

(*Continued on Page* 100)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVIII MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1936 No. 5

FORCE VERSUS PERSUASION

. . . But I think that young men who exercise their understanding, and expect to become capable of teaching their fellow citizens what is for their interest, grow by no means addicted to violence, knowing that on violence attend enmity and danger, but that by persuasion the same results are attained without peril, and with good will; for those who are compelled by us hate us as if despoiled of something, while those who are persuaded by us love us as if they had received a favor. It is not the part, therefore, of those who cultivate the intellect to use violence; for to adopt such a course belongs to those who possess brute force without intellect. Besides, he who would venture to use force had need of no small number of allies, but he who can succeed with persuasion had need of none, for, though left alone, he would think himself able to persuade; and it by no means belongs to such men to shed blood, for who would wish to put another man to death rather than to have him a living subject persuaded to obey?

—*Xenophon,* in "Memorabilia."

IS PEACE BANKRUPT?

A correspondent of the New York *Times* has declared that it is! Peace is bankrupt in the sense that all the peace hopes built up out of the War have collapsed, and we are right back where we started in 1913-14. Not since ancient times has there been such an absolutely naked reliance upon force as there is today. Every peace program has failed—the Lausanne agreement, the Locarno Pact, the Briand-Kellogg Treaty, the invulnerable endeavors and understandings to the end of disarmament. Every peace institution has cracked up—the Hague Tribunal, the World Court, the League of Nations. The dominant powers on the earth today are the dictators in Japan, Russia, Germany, Italy, Poland, who are as savage as any of the barbarian chieftains who sacked Rome. No responsible statesman or public leader would seek security in such a time as this in anything but arms on land and sea and in the air. Witness the recent surrender of the Labor Party in England to the Tory policy of defense! So runs the argument. But it does not convince us. Why should we ever have built any peace hopes in the War? How could any programs or institutions of peace have survived out of that mad struggle? As well expect brotherhood to be established in Spain as the result of the present strife! What we are at present suffering is the consequence of the doom imposed upon us by the experience of 1914-18. We are now liquidating, in disappointments, frustrations, collapses of all our endeavors and our hopes, what the War actually did to us. Not until the uttermost farthing has been paid shall we be able effectively to find peace. Meanwhile, there is all the while generating out of our miseries such a body of peace sentiment as the world has never seen before. There are more pacifists among us—more men and women who do not want to fight—and *will not fight*—than we dare imagine. "Prepare ye the way of the Lord!" That's what we are doing these days—preparing the way in the souls of men. And some day the Lord will come!

PEACE AND THE SPANISH SITUATION

The immediate difficulties of peace were never more strikingly, indeed appallingly, presented than by the situation now working out its bloody consequences in Spain. At the heart of the problem lies the question of neutrality. When the civil war became serious, France and England promptly initiated a policy of international neutrality, in which twenty-five other nations were later induced to join. This policy was established in the interest of peace. Blum and Baldwin rightly saw that the issues which divided the Spanish combatants were issues which divided people in practically every European country, and that, if avenues were opened for armed help to loyalists and rebels, Europe would straightway become divided, even as Spain itself, and a Spanish war would become a European or even world war. So the neutrality policy was a genuine endeavor after peace. But look at the result! While the democratic countries, of course sympathetic with the republic in Spain, kept hands off and thus left the republic to do its own fighting and to furnish its own arms, the Fascist countries, as incontrovertible evidence seems to show, paid no attention to the neutrality pact, but from the beginning poured men and arms into the hands of the rebel forces in Spain. This might have been expected, for when have Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany ever kept any promises which they found it convenient to break? It is this active assistance of the Fascists which has brought victory to the rebel cause, and thus sealed the fate of the Spanish republic, and in the end, of course, through the creation of one more Fascist state, will add one more dreadful influence

to peace in Europe. The very policy which was dictated by the fear of war, in other words, has now brought war only so much the nearer. This is a typical dilemma in the whole peace problem of the world. Time and again, the Fascist states get the jump on their rivals, to their own great advantage, because the latter have a primary interest in peace and the former have not. Yet these latter cannot move effectively without themselves endangering peace! It's a riddle worthy of the Sphinx.

THE CURRENCY AGREEMENT AND PEACE!

The devaluation of the franc, accompanied by Italy's action in devaluing the lira, has been hailed by the press as an epoch-making victory for peace. Maybe so! Unlike the great majority of the human race, we do not pretend to know very much about currency problems, and this may well be the reason why we do not exactly see the connection. Undoubtedly, the stabilization of the currency is a policy which will lead to a revival of international trade between Britain, France, and America. But there never has been any serious war danger between these three countries. And wherein does any financial agreement between these essentially friendly powers even lightly touch the deep-founded occasions of conflict that vex the life of Europe? We have not seen any tendency to let up on military preparations in the various nations since this currency agreement was announced. Nor have we noted any spreading of the "good neighbor" spirit. On the contrary, before the ink was dry on the papers, the United States was snarling at Russia, Hitler was snapping at France, and the neutrality conference was making something like a new record for bitterness and hate. Now comes the *coup d'état* in Austria, which means the fevered expectancy of war. What is really significant about this currency affair is not financial at all but political. The whole business is nothing but a rallying of Britain and America to the side of France in the hour of her most direful extremity since the close of the Great War. More nearly than any of us is allowed to know, France is standing upon the very brink of civil war and chaos. The Blum government, and with this government the Republic itself, is trembling in the balance. So far from being a sign of increased security, the whole devaluation business means a more critical situation in Europe than surface indications yet reveal. The failure of neutrality, like the failure of sanctions before it, the triumph of the Fascist rebels in Spain, the growing truculence of Mussolini in the Mediterranean, above all the increasing internal difficulties of France, were bringing a crisis of dreadful portent—and Britain and America rushed to give aid before it was too late! Now we have Britain, America and France lined up together in what seems all too much like a triple entente in preparation for the next war.

THE EMERGENCY PEACE CAMPAIGN

The recognition of an "emergency" has led to the organization of this "peace campaign" which is probably the most formidable movement for peace that this country has ever known. The emergency is obvious —if we are to secure peace, it must be *now,* before all is swept away by the next war, and it must be by an endeavor in some way commensurate with the crisis everywhere apparent in the world at large. The campaign was launched last spring, and this winter will be conducted on a scale which will cover the entire nation from coast to coast. There has been wisdom in the resolve not to compete with existing peace agencies, but to work in and through them. This has led to some unseemly scrambling for money and prestige, but this may be set down not to selfishness at all but rather to genuine enthusiasm for a cause. Central to the whole undertaking is agitation and education through public meetings, made possible by such a corps of speakers as has seldom been marshalled for any movement in this country outside of presidential and other political campaigns. It reminds us, in its thoroughness of organization, its zest and zeal, its conception of sustained and widespread effort, of the campaign put over in 1917 to get us into the War and keep us there. But this is God's work, not Mars' or Satan's, and its significance is thus momentous. The only thing to match the Emergency Peace Campaign, so far as we know, is the great movement for pacifist enrollment in England, headed by "Dick" Shepherd, of St. Paul's. We could wish that the American crusade had taken the absolutist position of our English brethren—no participation in war in any way or on any plea! The Emergency Peace Campaign, hoping to cut a wider swath, is swinging a duller scythe. But we may be thankful for an undertaking ably led, generously financed, sacrificially motivated, which may save America, if not the world, from war.

THE CAMPAIGN—A SURVEY

The presidential campaign will reach its climax at just the moment when this issue of UNITY is published. No survey forward is possible, for this paper proposes to indulge in no prophecies in a conflict as uncertain in its outcome as this. But a survey backward may be interesting and profitable. The campaign as a whole has been conducted on a low level of intelligence and moral appeal. There have been no great speeches—no oratory of sweeping power and passion. Borah might have given the country some noble utterance, but the Senator chose not to enter the national arena. "Al" Smith has been a notable campaigner in his day, and his "walk" in this campaign was a first-class sensation, but his addresses were fumbling in manner and peevish in tone. Hoover, for all his greatly improved epigrammatic style, still remained stodgy and ineffective. Lemke was serious but shallow; Father Coughlin abusive, vul-

gar, demagogic. Knox was commendably energetic, indeed tireless, but prevailingly noisy rather than profound. Garner, for obvious reasons, was still most of the time, but when he spoke sounded like a cracked phonograph record. Norman Thomas stood out above and beyond all the other leaders for his dignity, power, thorough mastery of his subject, and able presentation of his argument. As for the two leading candidates, Landon made speeches far more competent than had been anticipated, and addressed an attack upon the New Deal which was straight to the mark and not seldom effective. But the Kansas Governor is as little a popular leader as he is a popular orator, and thus failed to sustain what he tried so hard to start. Roosevelt, in his campaigning, was never more suave and persuasive in manner, never more empty and evasive in matter. With incomparable shrewdness he simply refused to discuss issues or offer programs, and complaisantly fell back upon returning prosperity. As for the contending managers, Farley was the characteristic past-master of organized politics, deeply and silently playing his game, while Hamilton was the excited freshman, all noise, and color, and naiveté. Meanwhile, underneath the surface froth, stirred the deeps of public sentiment. This election will produce the greatest outpouring of votes in the country's history—*with what result?*

THE NEWS IN OUR NEWSPAPERS

What the newspapers regard as news is a never-ceasing source of wonderment. Two contemporary stories crowding the columns of our best as well as of our worst newspapers show what we mean. Some weeks ago three reporters, representing such papers as the New York *Times,* the New York *Evening Journal,* the New York *World-Telegram,* and others cooperating through the United Press and the Hearst syndicates, started out à la Nellie Bly to circumnavigate the globe. This was a deliberate attempt, please note, to create news out of nothing, to manufacture a story for sensation. The exploits were launched in the midst of the climax of a presidential campaign, of the mounting horrors of the Spanish civil war, of successive crises of war in Europe, and of a sudden and dangerous flare-up in the Sino-Japanese difficulty, to say nothing of the world series baseball games and the opening of the football season. It would seem as though there were enough going on in the world to hold public attention and sell newspapers. But no!—there must be some *real* news! And so, in this supremely critical period of human history, these hop-skip-and-jump reporters were sent around the globe, in order that our daily press might have something to print. The second story now holding our newspapers agog is that of Mrs. Simpson and Edward VIII. Even in a democracy there seems to be something fascinating about a king. Yet to anybody who is at all familiar with the history of royalty, this particular story is so utterly commonplace as to be utterly boring as well. What is there of either interest or excitement in the latest addition of the female friendships of rulers, especially in this case which involves a woman as commonplace apparently as the episode itself? But the papers play it up as though Spain were a little backyard brawl, Russia, a fleeting and trivial happening, and all Europe of comparative unimportance. News standards—what are they? Or are we all children, imbeciles, that stuff like this should be forced upon us for our daily feeding?

AUTOMOBILES AND DEATH!

What are we going to do about slaughter on our highways? The automobile is still the king of death, and the king's rule is extending rather than diminishing. Labor Day reports showed 251 dead from automobiles, and only 28 from all other causes (drowning, aeroplanes, railroad, and bus). The monthly record of this present year as compared with last year is steadily rising, and last year's ghastly total of dead in automobile accidents, therefore, is certain to be exceeded. A record of 40,000 deaths a year is not far distant! What are we going to do? Well, some states are doing something. New York, for example, has this year greatly added to the severity of punishments for careless and dangerous driving. Drunken driving is heavily penalized, and the speed limit is set at 40 miles per hour in the sense that any speed over this rate establishes presumption against the driver. Massachusetts is also taking drastic action. All drivers over 65 years of age are being re-examined for fitness, and any one driving over 50 miles an hour is to be relieved of his license and, if involved in an accident, of his license plates. We are informed that automobile manufacturers have agreed not to emphasize the element of speed in their advertisements. All of which is to the good, especially the attempt to cut down *speed.* Speed is involved in most accidents, and invariably in the worst ones. But two other factors, we believe, have yet to be dealt with adequately. The first is drunken driving—or, as one writer has put it, *drinking* driving, for a driver does not have to be out-and-out drunk to be a hazard on the road. Just to take a drink is enough! So long as liquor is available in every hotel, roadhouse, and lunch-wagon, and so long as present drinking habits prevail, the automobile will continue to be the chief instrument of death in our time. There is only one thing to do here, and that is to get rid of booze, and some day we'll know it. The other factor not yet effectively dealt with is the young person at the wheel. It's all right to go after the old folks, as Massachusetts is doing, for age slows up the faculties and deadens sensitivity. But for one person over 65 who is unfit to drive there are a hundred persons not over 18, or 20, or even 25, who are not fit to drive. Youth is quick, no doubt about that, but also careless, rash, a glutton for speed, and an inveterate "show-off." It all comes down to a sense of responsibility—and as that is a rare quality in human nature, the automobile problem remains.

Jottings

The cause of peace still marches on. Twenty-four hundred (2400) members of the Church of the Brethren have signed a statement declaring that war is contrary to the Christian religion and that they will therefore not participate in war, no matter what the cause.

Jack Dempsey and Joe Louis have come out for the re-election of President Roosevelt. The enormous impressiveness of this fact is matched by the announcement that Geraldine Farrar is for the election of Mr. Landon.

Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, and the Reverend Gerald Smith, successor to Huey Long as leader of the Share-the-Wealth Movement, are the presidential candidates now being named for 1940. *God save the state!*

Mr. Roosevelt once called "Al" Smith "the happy warrior." We suppose now that the President might call him *the peevish pirate!*

"Al" Smith once called Mr. Roosevelt "an old potato." We suppose now that the ex-Governor would call him *an aging tomato!*

Good for Belgium! In the growing belligerency of Europe, she doesn't propose to play the catspaw again for France and England. It has been a long time in coming, but the lesson of 1914 has evidently at last been learned.

Devaluation, like Mesopotamia, is a grand word. But what it means is that hard-working and unoffending people have the value of their money taken away. This process may be disguised by a million phrases and justified by as many excuses, but it still remains what it is—*robbery!*

J. H. H.

Peace and War Legislation in the Seventy-Fourth Congress

JESSE M. MacKNIGHT

In 1935 and 1936 the trend continued towards increasing militarization of the nation. Over one billion dollars was appropriated for military and naval purposes in 1936. Sharp attacks on Army and Navy budgets were made during both sessions of the Seventy-fourth Congress. A growing awareness of the danger to our civil liberties and international relations led to the development of a sturdy minority bloc fighting for a clear-cut policy of defense and against the preparation for foreign wars.

In the annual departmental supply bills, the following sums were appropriated:

	Army	*Navy*	*Total*
1935-36	$355,000,000	$482,000,000	$837,000,000
1936-37	387,000,000	528,000,000	915,000,000

Supplemental appropriations, unexpended balances and reappropriations, however, gave the Army and Navy a total of approximately $1,086,000,000 for 1936-37.

The 1937 War Department appropriations provide a regular army of 165,000 enlisted men, additional funds for ROTC, CMTC and ORC expansion, a national guard of 200,000 enlisted men, increased air corps plane and personnel strength, and the beginning of a tremendous program for strengthening seacoast defenses on the Pacific coast and in Panama and Hawaii. Attempts to eliminate funds for schools and colleges compelling attendance at military drill were beaten in both houses. In the House, Congressman Marcantonio's amendment was defeated by a voice vote. The Senate by a vote of 59-18 voted down a similar amendment of Senator Frazier (R., N. D.). A proposal by Congressman McFarlane (D., Tex.) to establish a ten per cent profit limitation on army air construction was accepted by the House but rejected by the Senate.

Under a gag rule, the 1936-37 naval appropriations bill was rushed through both houses late in the session. One and one-half afternoons were devoted to consideration of the half-billion dollar measure in the House. Similar tactics in the Senate prevented any reasonable consideration of this all-important bill. An attempt to eliminate battleship construction was defeated in the House by a vote of 212-73 and by a 40-12 vote in the Senate.

The naval appropriation bills during both sessions continued the treaty navy construction program. Air strength was increased and the navy enlisted personnel brought to the 100,000 mark. Naval Reserve activities were expanded and Naval Academy enrollment boosted. Testimony published by the House Naval Affairs Committee revealed that the cost of maintaining a treaty navy in the future would average approximately $550,000,000 annually.

Attacks on the cost, efficiency, and purpose of the existing national defense program were numerous. Congressman Boileau (Prog., Wis.) in H.R. 9134 and Senator King (D., Utah) in S. 388 proposed combining the Army and Navy into a single department of national defense for the purpose of efficiency and the elimination of aggressive weapons. Senator Benson (F. L., Minn.) in S. J. Res. 263 and Congressman Luckey (D., Neb.) in H. J. Res. 609 proposed a survey by a civilian commission to establish a policy of national defense in harmony with our international obligations and neutrality laws, to promote efficiency and understanding and to reduce expenditures. Congress-

man O'Malley (D., Wis.) introduced H. R. 12216 providing that the Army, Navy or Marine Corps would be prohibited from protecting any private interest abroad. All of these measures placed an emphasis on protection against invasion rather than on the existing Army-Navy policy for fighting foreign wars. No action was taken but considerable sentiment for such proposals manifested itself in both houses during the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The Frontier Air Base Bill, H. R. 7022, introduced by Cogressman Wilcox (D., Fla.), was enacted into law in 1935. This measure authorizes the establishment of key air bases in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone. It is estimated that the project will cost in the neighborhood of $120,000,000 when completed. Considerable international friction was aroused when so-called secret testimony, given by a high-ranking Army officer, revealed War Department plans for a "disguised" base near the demilitarized Canadian border. No appropriations were contained in the bill but a recent War Department announcement showed that a survey is now under way for an Alaskan base capable of handling a fleet of 1,000 heavy bombing planes.

Without debate or a record vote in either house, three important Army Air Corps expansion bills, H. R. 11140, H. R. 11920 and H. R. 11969, introduced by Congressman McSwain (D., S. C.), were approved by Congress in 1936. These measures increased Army airplane strength to 2,320 planes, authorized an expanded air corps personnel and proposed an air reserve training corps for young people. The increases were accepted by the President but the training corps proposal was vetoed on the grounds of economy. Several other measures to develop lighter-than-air craft construction died in committee.

Congressman Maas (R., Minn.) in H. R. 11681 and H. R. 12847 proposed increases in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves. Both measures remained in committee. A bill by Congressman Vinson (D., Ga.), H. R. 11369, to authorize the construction of an auxiliary fleet for the Navy was defeated when the measure failed to get consideration in the House. The Bland-Copeland Merchant Marine Bill, H. R. 8555, supported by a national defense plea and providing outright subsidies for ship construction and operation, was enacted into law in the closing hours of the Congress.

The Nye-Kvale Bill, H. R. 8950 and S. 3309, which would substitute optional for compulsory military training in schools and colleges, was given a public hearing by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Congressman Maverick (D., Tex.) introduced two bills, H. R. 11078 and 11079, providing for the elimination of honorary positions for women in the ROTC and prescribing a special reading course in the ROTC on the horrors of war. No action was taken by the House Military Affairs Committee on these bills. The proposal of Senator Bulkley (D., Ohio), S. 3403, for short-term enlistment of unemployed young people was not acted upon by the Senate.

The proposal of Congressman Ludlow (D., Ind.), H. J. Res. 167, to hold a national referendum before declaring war, was blocked in the House Judiciary Committee. An attempt was made to discharge the committee from consideration of the bill. The 218 signatures needed were not secured and the bill remained in committee.

In 1935, H. J. Res. 117, a resolution making appropriations for relief purposes, was amended in the Senate by Senator Thomas (D., Utah). The amendment provided that no part of the relief funds in the measure should be expended for munitions, warships, or naval material. The amendment was accepted by a vote of 71 to 11 in the Senate.

Economic Policies: A continuing attack on the Administration's reciprocal trade program, which expires in 1937, was made by Republican opponents of the measure throughout the two sessions of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Proposals advanced by anti-Administration forces included outright repeal of the act, Senate ratification of agreements, repeal of specific agreements (especially that with Canada) or increase in tariff duties on certain items. Strong support of the policy by the Administration prevented any alteration in the program of increasing our export trade by allowing certain foreign commodities access to our market.

The war debt situation remained unchanged, with Finland the only nation meeting its obligations. Although Senator Lewis (D., Ill.) exercised his oratorical powers on many occasions, there was no real attempt to settle the problem in 1935 or 1936. Bills were introduced by Senator McAdoo (D., Cal.), S. J. Res. 222, Senator Barbour (R., N. J.), S. 4031, and Congressman Ellenbogen (D., Pa.), H. R. 10310, proposing the creation of a debt commission to negotiate and recommend a solution. Senator Tydings (D., Md.) proposed in S. Res. 141 an international conference on war debts, disarmament, currency stabilization, and world trade.

Japanese imports were attacked repeatedly in 1935 and 1936. Bills were introduced to raise tariffs against certain Japanese products but negotiation through the State Department of a "gentlemen's agreement" and presidential action increasing customs duties on specific items obviated the necessity for congressional action. An investigation made by the Tariff Commission in 1935 revealed the lack of any widespread Japanese textile competition and the subject was dropped.

Bills to create a Foreign Trade Board were introduced by Senators Lewis (D., Ill.) and Sheppard (D., Tex.). No action was taken by either house on this subject.

Neutrality: Force of public opinion resulted in the passage of the temporary neutrality law in August, 1935. Considerable pressure was necessary, however, before action was taken by Congress. The Administration's hand was forced by a determined congressional bloc led by Senators Nye (R., N. D.), Clark (D., Mo.), Bone (D., Wash.) and Congressmen Maverick (D., Tex.), Christianson (R., Minn.), Tobey (R., N. H.), Sauthoff (Prog., Wis.), Sisson (D., N. Y.), Kopplemann (D., Conn.) and Ludlow (D., Ind.).

The congressional bloc fought for a mandatory law on munitions, loans and credits, travel, shipping in American bottoms, and a licensing system for trade and manufacture in arms. The Administration forces blocked action for weeks in attempting to secure a permissive law giving the President power to discriminate in the application of embargoes.

In August, 1935, S. J. Res. 173, to be in effect until February 29, 1936, was passed as a compromise. Under the terms of this bill, effective on presidential proclamation of a state of war, a mandatory embargo

on munitions, control of passports, regulation of the use of American shipping and a licensing system for manufacture and trade in arms was made a public law. The time limit was established in order that the question might be re-examined in full by the second session.

Armed conflict in East Africa resulted in the issuance of a presidential proclamation invoking the terms of the Neutrality Act and a further plea by the Administration that trade in such war materials as oil be kept down to the lowest possible figure. Intense interest in broadening the terms of the temporary act was apparent in the fall and winter months preceding the opening of Congress in January, 1936. President Roosevelt, in his Annual Message to Congress on January 2, went on record for the enactment of stronger neutrality legislation.

When Congress began its deliberations, several neutrality measures were introduced. The bills of Senator Pittman (D., Nev.) and Congressman McReynolds (D., Tenn.) represented the Administration viewpoint of flexibility and presidential prerogative. The proposals of Senators Nye and Clark and of Congressmen Maverick, Kopplemann, and Ludlow were mandatory, and sharply limited presidential powers. The general tenor of the bills was very similar but the Administration measures depended, in certain particulars such as the cash and carry policy, upon presidential wishes. Subjects covered by the various bills included: (1) Time of embargo proclamation on arms, ammunition, and implements of war; (2) quotas for war materials; (3) loans and credits; (4) American vessels as carriers; (5) cash and carry; (6) travel of American citizens; (7) use of American ports; (8) use of American flag, and (9) American rights in international law.

Considerable maneuvering took place in both houses of Congress during January and February. As the expiration date of the temporary law drew near, it was evident that the Administration forces were losing their enthusiasm for very much stronger legislation. The dilatory tactics of Administration leaders in both houses allowed opponents of strict neutrality to organize a counter-offensive against action, and resulted in considerable pressure from advocates of the freedom of the seas, of financial and economic interests, and from Italian sympathizers. Under this pressure and the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Administration leaders, the congressional bloc suffered a partial defeat in the passage of another temporary act extending the old law to May 1, 1937, with loans and credits added to the prohibited list. An additional proviso that the terms of the measure do not apply to nations of the Americas, if such countries be in conflict with non-American states, was incorporated in the bill.

International Cooperation: The Department of State, once characterized by Charles Evans Hughes as the "Department of Peace," received appropriations of $15,938,565 for 1936 and $16,111,934 for 1937. The State Department budget for 1937 is approximately one-seventieth of the sum set aside for national defense purposes.

The Geneva Arms Treaty of 1925 was ratified by the Senate in June, 1935. This agreement, signed by 44 nations in Geneva on June 17, 1925, provides that all signatories shall make quarterly reports on the export and import of armaments and shall not ship armaments into any country without the consent of its government.

Membership in the International Labor Organization, begun in 1934, was continued through annual appropriations contained in the State Department budget. Isolationist sentiment, especially in the House, manifested itself in both the 1935 and 1936 debates on the departmental supply bill. The Administration forces were able on both occasions to override this opposition without much difficulty. Approximately $350,000 is the annual appropriation of the United States for American participation.

The World Court was debated in January, 1935. A strong fight by the "isolationist" bloc in the Senate, led by Senator Borah (R., Idaho) and Senator Johnson (R., Cal.), aided by the Hearst press and Father Coughlin, enabled opposition forces to cut into the two-thirds vote required for passage. The final vote was 52-36, seven votes less than the necessary two-thirds to secure passage. Considerable criticism has been made of Administration leaders for the failure of this measure, since the Democratic Party, pledged in the 1932 platform to World Court membership, had more than two-thirds of the Senate membership.

Senator Pope (D., Idaho) proposed in S. J. Res. 119 American membership in the League of Nations. The Pope resolution recognized the Pact of Paris as the guiding principle of the League Covenant and specifically exempted the United States from using armed force for the League. No action was taken by the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

Participation in the 1936 Inter-American Conference, to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, was unanimously approved by both houses in S. J. Res. 248.

The London Naval Treaty of 1936 was ratified by the Senate in May, 1936. This convention replaces the provisions of the Washington Treaty of 1922 and the London Treaty of 1930 which expires in December, 1936. The treaty passed in a very lukewarm senatorial atmosphere. Debate was limited and it was generally admitted by the supporters of the measure that the treaty accomplished practically nothing in the limitation of armaments.

The most important feature of the treaty is the provision that advance notice must be given by signatories four months before any construction is begun. The prior treaties provided for quantitative limitation of capital ships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The 1936 treaty, based on qualitative limitation, through restrictions on the size and character of ships, has no provision for quantitative limitations. With the denouncing of the Washington Treaty of 1922 by Japan in 1934, the United States is now free to fortify areas west of Hawaii.

Measures affecting international relations on which no action was taken are those of: Congressman Fenerty (D., Pa.), who in H. Con. Res. 35 proposed withdrawal of American recognition of Russia; Congressman Tinkham (R., Mass.), who in H. J. Res. 41 proposed United States withdrawal from the International Labor Organization, in H. J. Res. 420 advocated withdrawal of American adherence to the Kellogg Pact, and in H. J. Res. 434 advocated withdrawal from the London Naval Treaty.

Congressman Dunn (D., Pa.) in H. J. Res. 453 would have authorized the President to secure a sixty-day truce in the Italo-Ethiopian dispute. Senator King

(D., Utah) in S. J. Res. 154 would have authorized an examination of Japanese policy in the Far East, and in S. Res. 174 an inquiry into the matter of the treatment of Jewish and Catholic citizens of Germany. Agitation to have the United States intervene in the Mexican church question was fruitless.

Publication in 1935 by Rear-Admiral Yates Stirling of inflammatory statements regarding the Soviet government led to the introduction by Congressman Scott (D., Cal.) and Congressman Marcantonio (R., N. Y.) of resolutions in the House in the nature of censures of the Admiral. A bill was introduced in the Senate on July 15, 1935, by Senators Nye and Clark seeking to prohibit officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps from making public statements or publishing articles relating to international affairs without express authority from their respective cabinet officers. It was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Congressman Biermann (D., Iowa) proposed the establishment of a Bureau of Peace in H. R. 6687. Senator Neely (D., W. Va.) proposed in S. 1442 the creation of an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Peace.

Munitions and War Profits: The Munitions Investigating Committee, with Senator Nye (R., N. D.) as chairman, completed its work this year. Extensive hearings were held during 1935 and 1936. A seven-part (possibly eight-part) report on the findings and recommendations has been printed.

The Nye Committee reports include the following subjects: (1) Naval shipbuilding; (2) war-time taxation and price control; (3) activities of munitions companies; (4) industrial mobilization plans of the War Department; (5) neutrality; (6) banking, loans, and credits; (7) government manufacture of munitions, and possibly (8) a summary of previous reports.

The committee disclosed profiteering in naval shipbuilding, recommended a strong war profits taxation program and condemned the activities of munitions companies. In its report on the War Department industrial mobilization plan, the committee found that the Army was planning a dictatorship over labor in war time. The committee urged stronger, mandatory, neutrality legislation, control of loans and credits in war time, and by a four-to-three vote favored nationalization of munitions production.

Strong opposition to the committee's activities was evident throughout the hearings. Senator Dickinson (R., Iowa) attacked, as communistic, the committee's investigating staff in the spring of 1935. During the 1936 hearings an open breach in committee ranks over the subject of President Wilson's war-time actions was barely averted and enough funds to complete the study were secured.

H. R. 5529, a bill on the control of war profits, was introduced by Congressman McSwain (D., S. C.) on February 7, 1935. The bill, ostensibly to take the profits out of war, was in fact a preparedness measure, which, under the cover of its title, outlined a plan for regimenting human, financial, and industrial resources in the event of war. Labor fought on the side of the peace forces, and after a stiff battle in April, 1935, the provision for automatic drafting of men between twenty-one and thirty-one "into the service of the United States" was amended and then stricken out.

The bill, emasculated by elimination of this and other bad features, passed the House and was sent to the Senate where it was entirely rewritten by the Nye Committee and referred to the Finance Committee. A long delay ensued before the measure was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee. The tax program of the Nye Committee was scaled down on the theory that high taxes hurt war-time production. The bill, though on the Senate calendar, was not debated.

Two bills, S. 3098 and S. 3099, to prevent profiteering and collusion in naval construction were introduced in June, 1935, by Senator Vandenberg (R., Mich.). These measures were deemed necessary to keep down the huge excess profits to private shipbuilders under existing practices. The Naval Affairs Committee took no action on the bills.

Through H. R. 5730, introduced by Congressman Vinson (D., Ga.), the ten per cent profits limitation on naval ship and air construction contained in the 1934 Tobey amendment to the Naval Building Bill was removed, despite a battle. The Vinson measure increases profits through computation on a yearly rather than contract basis. Congressman Tobey (R., N. H.), MacFarlane (D., Tex.) and Scott (D., Cal.) led a strong opposition fight but were defeated, June 12, 1935, 208-150. The Senate passed the bill under unanimous consent in June, 1936.

Civil Liberties: The most direct attempt in recent years to curb constitutional guaranties of a free press and free speech was incorporated in the notorious Military Disaffection Bill, introduced in 1935. This measure, jointly sponsored at the start by the War and Navy Departments, was introduced by Senator Tydings (D., Md.) and Congressman McCormack (D., Mass.).

The bill provided a fine and imprisonment for "whoever advises, counsels, urges or solicits," orally or in print, any member of the Army or Navy to disobey the laws or regulations of the services. In addition, the bill provided for the search and seizure anywhere of any such writings under a search warrant authorized by the 1917 Espionage Act. This peace-time sedition measure, applying to any one who criticized the Army and Navy, was deemed necessary to prevent the spread of communism in the Army and Navy. Testimony given by high-ranking officials had revealed little cause for any concern regarding communistic tendencies in the military or naval services.

The bill passed the Senate in June, 1935, under a unanimous consent rule without debate or record vote. Liberal senators were unaware of the threat contained in the bill. But in the House, Congressmen Maverick (D., Tex.) and Marcantonio (R., N. Y.), with other peace and labor supporters, prevented action through the adjournment of the first session.

Opposition in Congress and aroused public opinion blocked action in 1936. Newspapers and magazines, supported by peace forces, waged a steady battle against this sedition measure. Attempts to secure a special "gag" rule limiting debate to two hours for consideration of the bill were beaten down. Congressional advocates of the bill suffered a telling blow, in February, 1936, when Senator Tydings disavowed his support in a letter to Secretary of War Dern, revealing, by implication, that Navy Department and "patriotic" groups were the chief forces behind the legislation.

The Unpeaceful Pacific

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER

A San Francisco newspaper announcing the presence of its correspondent at the sixth conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations held in the Yosemite Valley the last two weeks in August said that the decisions arrived at by the delegates would either make or avert war in the Pacific. No such extravagant claim would be made by any one of the 150 members from eleven countries vitally interested in the problems of the Pacific.

It was a wholly unofficial gathering but many of its participants have either been in office in their respective countries or are likely to assume office in the near future. They were thus able to speak authoritatively on the policies and aspirations of their countries with a greater freedom than would have been possible were they now in office. Probably no basic opinions were changed at the conference but the frank round table discussions on delicate and critical problems of the Pacific gave each delegate an acquaintance with the point of view of countries other than his own and a much fuller understanding. And that, after all, is the only basis for arriving at peaceful solutions.

Obviously, with the foreign policies of the United States, Japan, China, and Russia under discussion for a period of two weeks, it would take a volume or so to cover the many subjects reviewed. But no matter which country was the subject of the round tables, the challenging factor of Japanese political and economic expansion kept bobbing into the discussions. It was by far the most delicate question of all those on the agenda. It kept the Japanese delegation continually on the defensive. From their immobile faces one could never guess whether they concealed angry and irritated feelings at the persistent pin-pricking questions. And probably every other delegate is still wondering what impressions that delegation reported to its government of the attitudes of the other countries represented. For in spite of their seeming stubborness of purpose the Japanese are deeply sensitive to the opinions of other nations and artlessly eager for approbation.

What are the motives of Japanese expansion? Why the terrific tempo which is upsetting the trade of other countries by its price-cutting and market-grabbing? Is it true that Japan's objective in trade expansion is merely to raise the standard of living for the Japanese people, to relieve a pressure of overpopulation? And, if this is so, in what way have the farmers and workers shared in the fabulous industrial profits of the last few years? What right have Japanese smugglers to flood North China with goods brought in under the protecting guns of the Japanese army, without payment of Chinese customs and over the protest of the legally constituted Chinese authorities? Is this part of a deliberate policy to destroy Chinese financial, as well as administrative, independence or to ruin British, American, and other law-abiding commercial interests in China along with Chinese commerce? Or is it merely a profitable business for individual Japanese? Is there an imperialistic motive in Japanese expansion and, if so, what is its object? These were among the questions that the American, British, Russian, French, Chinese, Dutch and other delegates flung at the Japanese who, after the inquisition of the first few days, found that polite evasion would not do. The delegates wanted direct answers.

The Japanese answered that the chief motive for their expansion policy was the population pressure. Two solutions presented themselves. One was rapid industrialization and the other emigration.

"But," said an Englishman, "your ruthless competition is ruining Lancashire and Lancashire *is England*. You have a right to expand, and to a place in the sun but you are expanding in other people's houses and even if you *should* have this right the owner of the house is sure to object." Before the war, this delegate said, Lancashire exported seventy-five per cent of the world's cotton. Five-sevenths of this trade is now gone. One-third of Lancashire's loss has been Japan's gain. Other English delegates thought Japan should accept some rule of order in industry, such as negotiating with similar industries in other countries, and not act "like a bull in a china shop."

Methods of Japan's high pressure industrialization were also objected to by English and American delegates. It was learned that in the cotton industry, for example, eighty per cent of the factory workers, brought in from the country, work on a contract system for a period of about three years for very low wages. They are then returned to their homes so that they may marry. English delegates especially felt that such standards amounted to unfair competition.

To this, Japanese delegates replied that the young girls were well looked after, that certain factories were even air-conditioned, and that fifteen per cent of the cost of management of some corporations went for social services in the factories, entertainment for the workers, and for the traditional instruction in tea ceremony and flower arrangement.

But the non-Japanese delegates were not satisfied. Have wages risen along with industrial profits, they insisted? Is labor encouraged to organize into independent trade unions so that the workers may take advantage of good times? Or, asked a Chinese delegate bitterly, have the profits gone into the budgets of the army and navy?

The Japanese seemed to be in a corner. They countered by saying that, although wages do not show a great advance, employment has increased. (I believe from information given me in Japan that statistics regarding unemployment cannot be compared with those of occidental countries because of the federal family system which takes care of most unemployed without public relief.) Other arguments to show that workers might be benefitting from the boom were that government savings deposits are continually increasing, and that sometimes workers have a radio or go to the movies. One eminent Japanese member admitted that he had heard no employer discuss the possibility or benefits of trade unions. When pinned down to Japanese government statistics and to their own "data papers" on which the conference based its discussions, the final impression was of a proletariat bearing all the sacrifices of Japan's determination for rapid trade expansion.

A French delegate declared that he was not satisfied that one of the chief motives of Japanese expan-

sion was emigration. Is the weakness of Japanese emigration, he asked, due only to the restrictive measures of certain countries or is it not rather the innate dislike of the Japanese to emigrate? In places where the barriers were down, such as Manchuria, Indo-China and Korea, there was almost no appreciable emigration. In Brazil where emigration was encouraged, the Japanese came and settled in little "Islands" with Japanese schools, doctors, and police. Brazilian authorities felt that this kind of national isolation constituted a potential menace and began to put restrictions on further immigration.

A Chinese who was impressed with the annual Japanese population increase of a million a year inquired cuttingly, "Supposing we find a place for this year's increase and next year we place another million and so on. When is this going to stop?" But the economists soothed his fears by historical reference to populations becoming gradually stabilized.

The Japanese conceded, then, that emigration would not settle Japan's problem but that it was a factor which should be considered. Japanese, it was explained, do not like to emigrate to cold countries. They prefer a climate similar to their own, such as they find in the United States, Southern Canada, Australia and the Dutch East Indies. Courtesy prevented the non-Japanese from saying on the floor what was said privately, that these countries have a higher standard of living than the Japanese, giving them a chance to undersell, whereas in Manchuria, Korea, and Indo-China the Japanese have the higher standard of living and cannot compete with native labor.

With the traditional proclivity for a logical approach, a French delegate pushed the argument on to the Japanese cry for free access to raw materials. What does this signify, they asked. In peace times raw materials are available to any purchaser who can pay the price. Does this mean they should be equally available to purchasers who will not or cannot pay for them either in the form of raw materials or in the form of credits or in the form of assignment of territories? At this point, the Russian and Chinese delegates came to attention.

The foreign policy of Japan, explained a Japanese professor of international law, is divided into two parts, one is for the Occident and one is for Asia. In both policies, Japan hopes to settle all its problems peacefully. The use of force in dealing with the Occident is unthinkable, but in Asia force may be necessary. Japan's interests in China include not only a desire for access to raw materials but she wishes to see political stability in China with a government friendly to Japan. She hopes that this may be established peaceably but, if China builds up a hostile government against her, other means may be required. Japan insists that communism emanating from either China or Russia is a menace to Japan and feels that China needs her help in crushing it out.

At this juncture, a Russian delegate arose. If the Japanese are afraid of communism, he said, then they cannot consider conditions in Japan as being very stable. Communism is not a commodity for export or import, he argued, but a social order. The U. S. S. R. has never entertained such pessimistic views, he further declared, as the need of war to solve problems existing between itself and Japan, and such a division of the world into two parts is against all statements issued by Japanese government officials.

Like stilettos came the arguments of resentful Chinese who have seen a puppet government set up in Manchuria and a so-called autonomous government established in North China, both sustained by the Japanese army.

Japan claims to have created an independent Manchuria, said one. Then in order to protect Manchuria from the hostile front of North China, she set up an autonomous government there. After a while she will need to protect this autonomous government with another acquisition of Chinese territory. Where is this to end? Today, smuggling of Japanese goods is done under protection of the Japanese army. Japan has assumed a political and economic protectorate over China with the right to decide who shall offer financial or technical assistance to China and in what way. Meanwhile, China has unified itself. Ninety per cent of the population, according to Dr. Hu Shih, China's best known intellectual, have given up their ancient attitude of patient waiting and are reorganizing their country on modern lines. No longer are Chinese depending on outside help but have stabilized their currency by themselves, are building roads, establishing airways, providing schools, and improving national health, but above all are organizing an army. It is thought by some that even the Chinese communists may subordinate their revolutionary aims to cooperate in a unified military onslaught against the Japanese.

And so Chinese pacifists have revised their position. "The general feeling," said a well-known Chinese Christian leader, in a moving appeal to the delegates, "is resistance. Even with the military preponderance of Japan over China, it is a serious matter to goad a nation to determined resistance, and this may lead to unexpected results. While there is yet time to arrest this attitude, won't the Japanese delegates endeavor to engender a feeling that cooperation in trade and in other matters must be based on a voluntary and reciprocal basis. Until we can feel such a basis is possible from Japan, I am afraid that things in China have reached such a point that something serious may happen in the near future. But here in this conference we may be able to set forces to work which may change the course of events in the two countries."

Towards the end of the conference when the question of peaceful adjustments was being discussed, the Japanese delegates were again pressed to answer the two questions which were in almost every delegate's mind. *What does Japan want? What is it Japan fears?*

And the answers came back. Japan wants free access to raw materials in peace times as well as in war times. She has chosen industrialization to solve her problems. She is afraid that even in peace times trade barriers will be erected to prevent her access to raw materials. Since she cannot provide her own raw materials she proposes to have them safely under her own control. And China is the answer. A stable government in China is a necessity for reciprocal trade. Japan feels it her duty to establish this kind of government. The conditions under which the Nine Power Treaty was negotiated in 1921-1922 guaranteeing China's territorial and administrative integrity are so completely changed by developments in Russia that one Japanese delegate went so far as to claim that the treaty was null and void. The establishment both of Manchukuo and of the "autonomous" government in North China were accomplished, he declared, by the

spontaneous uprising of the Chinese people there. Smuggling in North China was not done by the Japanese but by the Chinese. Thus the Japanese had not broken the Nine Power Treaty, as some other delegate had suggested, but the general feeling was that a new treaty should be negotiated that would take into consideration new world changes.

Other delegates were shocked at this bland statement and asked whether Japan would be willing to submit such questions as that of North China and Manchuria to an impartial world tribunal for decision. To this a Japanese delegate replied that he believed Japan would never be willing to have the judgment of outsiders on any major issue which affected her national security nor would she be willing to have any dispute regarding her non-fulfillment of the terms of a treaty interpreted by any third party. An English member objected to any uni-lateral interpretation of a treaty, while an American felt that the United States would not be inclined to make any treaties with a country which broke them at will. The Japanese member went on to declare that in his opinion the League of Nations needed revision, that consistently it had been a failure in large issues although in smaller ones it had achieved success.

These discussions did not lift the shadow of impending war from the Pacific. Japan is determined to persevere in her self-persuaded righteous cause and China is now resolved to fight back. The seriousness of this situation led to a number of proposals. Albert Sarraut, former prime minister of France, warned of the catastrophe that lay ahead unless some machinery for peace adjustment was devised. He suggested collective security by means of regional pacts pledging military sanctions and universal pacts pledging economic sanctions. A. V. Alexander, former first lord of the admiralty of Great Britain and present head of the British Cooperative movement, repeatedly declared the faith of the British delegation in collective security but suggested also the necessity of each nation cleaning its own house in respect to internal economic and social conditions so that the millions would no longer be pawns but should have access to all the best there is in life. Dr. V. E. Motylev, professor in the Institute of National Economy of the U. S. S. R., put forth an earlier proposal of Litvinov's that the Disarmament Conference should be reorganized into a Permanent Peace Conference meeting periodically in order to prevent war and its consequences, attached perhaps to the League of Nations but more accessible and elastic in its machinery than the League.

This was the glimmer of hope with which most delegates returned to their several homes. At least if the ideal of collective security was not unanimously endorsed, collective understanding was a concrete accomplishment of the conference.

A United Effort to Avert Suicide

KIRBY PAGE

Readers of UNITY do not need to be reminded that the nations are now rushing furiously toward the brink of a cataclysmic war. The only question we need to consider is this: what can pacifists and near-pacifists do about the matter? The Emergency Peace Campaign has been brought into being in an endeavor to answer this query. It was initiated by Ray Newton and other members of the Society of Friends, but quickly embraced leaders in many other peace agencies. Its operations are based on the assumption that a period of two or three years is probably the maximum time at our disposal before a big war breaks out. A three-fold program is being promoted; bring about the required changes in the economic and political relations of the nations; strengthen international agencies of justice; and build a powerful movement of men and women who will not approve of or participate in any war.

Methods relied upon for the accomplishment of this program are: Change public opinion; bring nation-wide pressure to bear upon government in behalf of peace legislation and against provocative war measures; bind together pacifists and near-pacifists in a national enrollment of peace workers.

The plan calls for six successive visitations to a given community by teams of outstanding peace leaders. The first wave occurred in April-May when 278 cities participated in this enterprise. The second cycle comes during October and November, and the third in January and February.

In the October series emphasis is being placed upon the issues affecting war and peace which are involved in the political campaign, and efforts are being put forth to secure answers from various candidates to a questionnaire which has been prepared by a Legislative Committee, of which Dorothy Detzer is chairman.

In our November meetings on the Sunday preceding Armistice Day and on Armistice Day the Campaign is seeking to enroll a large number of peace workers. The enrollment card reads as follows:*

> "I agree to take part in peace education and peace action directed toward the removal of the causes of war and the strengthening of pacific means of settling international controversies.
>
> And as a further means of helping to prevent war, in company with many other individuals in all sections of the nation:
>
> [Check (A) or (B)]
>
> (A) I hereby record my mature and resolute determination never to approve of or participate in any war, except to repel an unprovoked armed invasion of continental United States by a foreign foe.
>
> (B) I hereby record my mature and resolute determination never to approve of or participate in any war."

In January and February Miss Maude Royden is to visit 37 American cities in all parts of the nation. Miss Royden is probably the most famous and eloquent woman preacher of this generation. She was one of the most prominent and devoted pacifists in England during the World War and has been identified with the pacifist movement ever since. In the 37 cities that she is scheduled to visit, regional conferences are being planned. By this means she will be able to make a nation-wide impact.

During January and February the Emergency Peace Campaign is cooperating with many other peace groups in an attempt to bring simultaneous political

*Readers are urged to send to the Emergency Peace Campaign, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, for a dozen or a hundred free copies and circulate them widely.

pressure on the new Congress on behalf of an adequate neutrality measure and also in favor of international economic cooperation for the relieving of tension. Also an effort will be made to change the basic policy of the Army and Navy which now proceeds with the assumption that we must have an armed establishment large enough to fight anywhere in the world.

On April 6th the Emergency Peace Campaign is launching a No-Foreign-War Crusade. Twenty years after the United States entered a foreign war, this crusade will be launched to commit a vast number of American citizens to the proposal that they will not approve of and will not engage in any war waged by the United States on foreign soil. Many pacifists in the campaign go much further, of course, and take the position that they would not approve of or engage in any war whatsoever. The likelihood that the United States will be subjected to an armed invasion is extremely remote. Therefore, if the pacifists and the citizens who are unwilling to fight on foreign soil can combine, they may be able to exercise enough political power to keep this country out of any war.

The fifth cycle of the Emergency Peace Campaign will come in November, 1937, at which time it is expected that the primary emphasis will be on world cooperation to relieve economic tension.

One of the most challenging aspects of the Emergency Peace Campaign is found in the program of its youth section. During the summer about 200 young men and women, carefully selected and trained in Institutes of International Relations, served on about 40 teams or caravans in 23 different states. Each team spent the summer in a county, carrying the peace message into rural areas. This fall and winter, deputations of young people will go out from colleges and churches all over the nation with this message of peace.

More difficult and yet more important is the winning of organized labor to the anti-war position. The Emergency Peace Campaign has a capable staff in its Labor Division and a substantial beginning has been made in enlisting the support of influential labor leaders.

The threat of war is so imminent and the catastrophe would be so irreparable that every alert citizen is called upon to devote a maximum time to this effort to keep the United States out of war and to promote world peace.

Peace Campaigning in Kentucky

ALAN JENKINS

I was the leader this summer of an Emergency Peace Campaign group in Kentucky. Stationed in liberal-minded Berea, most of our work was done in the surrounding communities. With me were three college pacifists, one freshly graduated from Vanderbilt, one a Junior at North Carolina State College, and the third a Junior at Duke. Over a period of eight weeks we met about fifty groups with attendance ranging from ten to three hundred. Our meetings were held in churches, on schoolhouse steps, in college halls, in hotels, in homes, under trees, at a county fair, and in a tobacco barn. Nineteen communities were reached. Our interviews with college presidents, teachers, ministers, county agents, Kiwanis and Rotary chiefs, editors, army and ex-army men, business men, farmers, students, and housewives must have totaled sixty. We staged six performances in as many communities of the anti-war play *Gas*. On three occasions, one of these being the Gerrard County Fair, we sponsored the showing of peace education films. We wrote editorials for two local papers. We wrote Congressmen and aspirants for Congress for views on issues affecting world peace; one of the candidates we met and questioned. We sold books like Milne's *Peace with Honor,* Devere Allen's *The Fight for Peace,* Ponsonby's *Falsehood in War-time,* and the kind of dependable, illuminating booklet such as the Foreign Policy Association publishes.

Before invading Kentucky, we attended the Institute of International Relations held in June at Duke University. At Grinnell College in the Mid-West and at Whittier College on the Pacific Coast, other volunteers met at similar Institutes. There were two hundred and twenty-five of us, with forty of this number at Durham. After a fortnight of lectures and discussions at these Institutes, we scattered in forty-three units to twenty-three states. Each volunteer was to have five dollars a week for *all* expenses. This meant hardships ahead, but these college boys and girls had found a moral equivalent for war in zest for and consecration to an anti-war campaign. They were ready to live, at a deep level, Chesterton's quip: "An inconvenience is only an adventure wrongly considered." Some of us were absolute pacifists; some believed in the armed defense of our soil in case of invasion: all united in the conviction that we must strengthen pacific alternatives to armed conflict and that we must bring about "such political and economic changes as are essential to a just and peaceable world order." With such objectives in mind as adherence to the World Court, the promotion of disarmament, and the strengthening of our present neutrality legislation, we were prepared to stress the necessity of putting peace people in power. To readers of UNITY this will sound like an innocent enough program. Needless to say, many were quick to label it un-American, fanatical, and (of course!) communistic.

The attitude of an army man and of a teacher at a State Teachers' College was representative of the chief type of opposition we met—that of unthinking nationalism. The army man, a captain, was in charge of a CCC camp in the Kentucky hills. We told him who we were and said that we would like to put on a peace play for his boys. He gave his tobacco a meditative chew, then said: "You can give the play, but no anti-war talk." Another chew and he added: "I might lose my job." Then he gave us his philosophy of state in some such words as these: "I know men and how you can turn 'em around. When you start questioning what the Government does, you undermine faith in it. And once you undermine faith, there's no tellin' where you'll end. This Government has done good by me, and I'll support it whatever happens. Yes," he went on, "I know something about men. I've had a lot to do with 'em in the army, at camps like this, and in courts." At the thought of courts, the captain's face fell. "Let me tell you fellows," he said, "our courts are rotten." He proceeded

to bear out this unsolicited opinion with illustrations of the gross miscarriage of justice. Finally I interrupted: "I'm sorry to hear this, Captain. You're undermining my faith in our courts." At this he smacked the fist of one hand into the palm of the other and declared, explosively: "I don't care if I am!" We left the camp in a mild daze.

A belligerent display of nationalism was given by the teacher mentioned. At the Teachers' College where he gives a course in education, an ROTC unit is being established this fall. One of the boys with me, who has had military training and who feels that it does not promote the constructive citizenship its sponsors talk about, spoke in chapel against it. Mr. X was incensed. Our meeting over, he rushed to the platform and showered invectives like "coward," "traitor," and "spineless fool" upon the speaker. He was also angered because the speaker referred to some World War veterans of his acquaintance who feel that they were tricked into that foreign venture. Mr. X spent seventeen days in the Argonne Forest and feels otherwise. In reply to our question "What did we get out of the war?" he declared: "We showed the world that we are not a gutless nation." Here is a sample phase of our discussion with Mr. X, reproduced accurately in idea if not in word:

Question: "Mr. X, if our Government declared a war that you recognized as one of aggression, would you support it?"

Answer: "Certainly, with all loyal citizens. We must support the organization of which we are a part."

Question: "Mr. X, do you belong to a church?"

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "And you believe in loyalty to that organization?"

Answer: "Of course!"

Question: "Mr. X, do you think a clash between these loyalties of yours possible? Take in Germany, for instance. . . ."

Answer: "Oh, over there! It would never happen here."

It seemed useless to call Mr. X's attention to the fact that it has happened here.

Of course Mr. X may be right about *his* church. It may be safe for Mars. When we spoke to a young minister in Richmond about using his pulpit, he asked, warily: "You aren't fanatics, are you?" By this he meant absolute pacifists. I told him that some of us were (carefully withholding the name of Jesus) while others were not, and that we could emphasize other aspects of the problem in his meeting. He breathed more easily and gave us a night. The minister of a good-sized church in Lexington, who is glad that we went as Christian crusaders into the World War and who would like our army and navy to teach Mussolini a lesson, told us that we made a mistake in not "sticking to Jesus Christ." "I preach, on the average, one peace sermon a month," he declared, "and Jesus Christ is my message." What kind of Christ, we did not inquire. Other ministers were less bewildering in their views; some were wholehearted in their cooperation; perhaps a third of those we met showed evidence of prayerful thought upon one of the great issues facing the Church.

The Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs were not very responsive. A member of a service club in a small county seat gave me three reasons why my speech aroused hostility. "In the first place," he said, "you forgot to say that ours is one of the best little clubs in the world. You didn't clap the boys on the back. Then you told us that every country thinks it's superior and that we might do well to look into the idea of our own superiority. The boys aren't used to that kind of talk. Lastly, you told us that you are a pacifist. If you'd only left that word out, much of the rest of what you said might have gone over." This comment came from a merchant, a man who suffered in Czarist Russia because of his race. I shall remember him for many reasons, including this: he illustrates the necessity of thinking of all groups (clubs, church bodies, the Italian people, etc.) in terms of component individuals whose probable variations in thought and behavior should be a first premise in dealing with the group. While our reception from the service clubs was not very warm, there were men in them who were not only cordial to us but who bought our literature and even gave money to our national organization.

In talking with farmers, as with townsmen, we stressed the advantages of world trade, the fact that wars mother depressions, the amount of tax money poured down the armament hold, and the necessity for third-party agreement among nations. Two ideas, however, kept reappearing to qualify or annihilate our hopes: a distrust of other peoples that is almost congenital in the rural and hill areas, and the dogma that in armaments lies our present and probably future guaranty of peace.

What I have written is mostly on the dark side of the picture. Encouragement was not wanting. There was, for example, the man who had been in our regular army for many years but who had resigned (chiefly through his wife's influence) because he came to see so clearly the nature and results of militarism. After he had heard me one night in Richmond, he gave me a spirited handshake. "We've got to stop carrying guns," he said, "and carry that kind of message instead. I've never thought," he added, "about the position of army chaplains. Thank you for bringing that out." There was encouragement in the purchase of peace literature in rural communities where money is so scarce; in the deep hush of audiences during our play; in the cooperation of Berea friends; in the financial contributions, ranging from one to twenty-five dollars, to the campaign. These bright moments came just often enough to keep faith in our kind alive.

"What about the gun-toting in the Kentucky hills?" some one may ask. "Shouldn't we start at home with our peace program?" The answer is, "Yes." If we cannot live amicably as neighbors, we will not live amicably as nations. Tolerance, third-party settlement of major disputes, the power of redemptive love, must be practised within each country before we can hope for a peaceful world. But, in this rapidly narrowing community of nations, we must look both in and out. And the twin-threat of another great war and our participation in it is just real enough to make sense out of working for world peace in Kentucky or, for that matter, anywhere.

Dragon's Teeth

O. A. HAMMAND

In the dog days of 1914 and the months that swiftly followed, many a young man threw a rifle barrel over his shoulder and marched off to shoot and get shot for a dollar a day. As for the price—he was getting the regular price, though he had nothing to say about how much it was to be, nor about accepting the job. His overlord, the State, just made a call for men and he being a man was picked up. And for what? To go and fight the enemy. Whether it was necessary or desirable to fight the enemy was not discussed. That was none of his affair. That was another matter, for other people, at another time. He was to do just what he was told to do. He was told when to go to bed and when to get up; when to speak and when to keep still. He could not go anywhere, nor do anything, nor say anything without permission. As an individual; as a citizen; as a human being, he was cancelled out. He had just one duty: to obey orders.

As jobs go it was not a very good job. Many left better jobs, more suitable to their station in life and at a higher salary. Yet others, many others, had no job and never had had any job that was worth while and so had nothing to leave, and no regrets. Many, very many, had no great number of friends and no prospects and no place in the community and really welcomed the new condition in which they had no personal responsibility to make a living and were for the first time in their lives important persons and part of a big show.

When the bugles began to blow and the drums began to beat, all was excitement. America must keep out of war; everybody agreed on that proposition. That is, almost everybody agreed, for from the beginning there were a few who wanted to avenge Belgium and punish the ruthless invader. But America wanted to cash in on the deal. It would be a mistake for us to say that this desire was confined to the big munition makers and those conspicuous corporations and individuals known as the big profiteers. They of course were guilty and ready and willing to sell the young blood of America for contracts and concessions and subsidies, yet the little fellow who wanted the war, and helped to promote the war and carry on the war for selfish purposes, was just as much a munition maker and just as dishonorable and disreputable as the Merchants of Death who sent an agent to Geneva to wreck the disarmament conference.

Many boys were deeply moved by the conditions and went away to war with the fervor of Jesuits, full in the faith that they were fighting a war in defense of their country. For were they not told that it was so? Books and papers were published in support of the war. Preachers and teachers approved the war. Lawyers and doctors and writers and social workers told them, as they loved their country, to go and fight for it. The government appointed the Committee on Public Information, whose job was nothing else on earth than to invent dishonest propaganda; then this propaganda, in the name of truth and virtue, was imposed upon 65,000 four-minute men and 15,000 four-minute women, most of them innocent of what they were doing, and distributed throughout the country.

The boys had not been taught that their own government would deceive them, mislead them and double-cross them. They did not know that the censorship of the platform, the pulpit, and the press was to conceal the facts and the truth and to open the way for a flood of propaganda hatched up by the government at an expense of $6,700,000, with the agents of distribution working for nothing. Was the young man in the college and on the farm and in the office, the factory or the store expected to be wise enough to see through that mass of dishonesty and lies? To be sure, in that forward march were the big bass drums and the big bass viols, and every ambitious and selfish individual played his own little fiddle or his own squeaky little fife.

But why did they fight? The answer is not an easy one, for the causes of war are very much involved and very complicated. Yet there were reasons. Men have fought over religion, race, nationality, lands, and rivers. They have fought for women and slaves and pack animals; for raw material, goods, money, and markets. They have fought for popularity, position, place, and power. Besides the physical, the material, the financial, and the economic, there are still other reasons for contention and conflict. These, I believe, are psychological and philosophical. I know that the world looks on wars as economic, but is that correct? Only partly correct, it seems to me. To be sure, there are economic incentives. There are plenty of individuals who stand to profit by war, but is that the principal reason? I believe not. Is it not true that dishonest propaganda put out in a world educated to a war philosophy is very nearly the root of the war problem?

If those selfish people attempted to get rich quickly by some other dishonest or illegal method, could they do it so easily or on such a large scale? If they attempted to marshal the young men of the land to do bootlegging, or horse stealing or bank robbing or kidnapping, would everybody have a patriotic spell and feel compelled to respond? Certainly not. There is a reason why the boys are weak and almost helpless in the face of war. A doctor would say that they are predisposed to war.

Let me emphasize that there are those who want to make money, those who have no prospects and welcome any change, those who do not know what it is all about, and those who have a patriotic fervor: but these things do not account for the precipitation of a conflict so universal and so terrible. War is a memorable institution. It is the historical, habitual, and traditional thing. We have always heard about war; read about war; talked about war; and have occasionally had a war. We have glorified war; sanctified war; and praised war and warriors. We have been taught that war is necessary and inevitable and that it is the duty of every individual to do whatever he is told to do in time of war or danger of war; and now it is a difficult thing to be either intelligent, honest, or

courageous in consideration of war. This may be called a war philosophy. It requires a long period for the world to become indoctrinated with an idea, but when it has that idea, it takes a long time to get that idea out of its philosophy and make room for a new one.

There are the two conflicting ideas: the war philosophy and the peace philosophy struggling with each other. Between individuals the peace philosophy is well established, but between nations it is not so well established. If one man is killed, the moral sense is shocked and the legal machinery of city, county, and state is swiftly utilized to follow the offender to the ends of the earth and bring him back to trial. Why? Because a crime has been committed. The law recognizes a crime and a criminal, an offense and an offender. But if we multiply this murder by ten millions and call it war, there is no crime and no criminal, no offense and no offender, but every one in any way related to that transaction is a patriot and a hero — the economic warrior, the industrial warrior, the scientific warrior, the political warrior, the religious warrior, the patriotic warrior, the military warrior—every one who had any part in that transaction of mass murder is a patriot and a hero, and the extent of his participation is the measure of his patriotism and his heroism.

America knows all these things; yet we go on teaching a war philosophy and building a bigger war machine. We spend a large part of our national income for army and navy. If there is no enemy we create one. Every year the navy goes forth on a make-believe expedition, with make-believe attacks and defenses. We teach narrow nationalism and super-patriotism, and create international suspicion, fear, and hate. We crowd militarism into our schools, and assume that the gun, the tank, and the gas-bomb are the way of progress and civilization. This is preparing the soil for the dragon's teeth. Selfish and dishonest propaganda, the chief device of the war-makers, would be harmless if put out among a people intellectually, patriotically, and morally emancipated; but if we sow dragon's teeth in plowed ground an army of soldiers will spring up out of the earth.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Broken Toys

You've played all day—you've broken many toys—
Your little hands are reddened now and torn
With playing savage games. Your eyes are worn
And blackened pits of hate and fear where joys
Were meant to live. Volcanic fury, noise—
And all the hopes your surging hearts have borne—
Have weltered down beneath a weight of scorn . . .
Acclaim no longer waits him who destroys.

Put up your playthings, now; the day is past.
You've done your work as men and children must—
Allured by tinsel gods, and boom of drum,
And all the wizardry of earth's bombast . . .
Put up your toys—abandon them to rust;
You cannot use them when tomorrows come!

NOUREDDIN ADDIS.

Armistice Day

The notes of fife and bugle,
The steady roll of the drum,
Proclaim to the world another
Armistice Day has come.

Long lines of marching khaki
Come swinging into view,
Their olive drab enlivened
By Old Glory's starry hue.

"The Stars and Stripes Forever,"
And the crowd breaks into cheers,
While we seem to hear the echoes
From parades of other years.

The world forgets so easily
Those days when shot and shell
Converted a peaceful country
Into a war-crazed hell.

The years pass on so swiftly,
Still selfish instincts sway,
Still human pawns are slaughtered—
As we cheer for Armistice Day.

MARY E. ERWIN.

West Point War Drill

These are my sons, whom I have never borne,
All of these, young and stern, intent on drill
With engines more ingenious to kill
Than ages of torture planned. I watch and mourn,
Seeing them, millions of them, bloody, torn,
Dismembered, left to rot—along with still
Ardent young letters, burning with the will
To live—along with muddied boots they had worn.

Today these live—so beautiful, so strong,
Beloved and loving, fiercely proud of strength
But ignorant why they live or fight. How long
Shall these, our best, be taught to forfeit length
Of useful years and fruitful loins and wise
Growth into leadership for greed and lies?

MARY OWEN LEWIS.

No More War

Armistice Day after eons of sadness;
Armistice that not long ago
Swept the world by torrential gladness;
Dear God—may it always be so!

A hell of war through endless night,
Then Peace! But millions were dead.
A world submerged in grief and fright,
And peoples aged with dread.

Now to all, for all time and gender
We'll change the pattern of fate.
To Peace the world must at last surrender,
Peace triumphant—instead of hate!

LEONORA HUTCHINSON.

War: A Neurosis on the National Scale

PAUL PLUMMER SWETT

Thinking people concerned with the progress of civilization are confused by the persistence of nationalism and the resultant international strife and warfare. Three major sore spots, now evident in the world, are represented by Germany, Italy, and Japan. At the moment war threatens, or exists, as a result of some kind of inner urge on the part of these three States. Earnest people in all parts of America wonder why. It seems to be a fact that most people dread war and, as individuals, they would go to great lengths to avoid it. The wonder is that any group of people seems eager for it. So reasons are invented to explain the enigma. The need for greater space in crowded countries is put forth by certain writers. The necessity for colonial expansion by the countries with dense populations sounds plausible. The want of raw materials for industrial purposes is another frequently-assigned cause for aggressiveness on the part of certain states. Fear of near neighbors, jealousy of others, and a militant pressure to extend one's cultural system are amongst the more common explanations advanced by many writers. When all of these are scrutinized closely, they fail fully to convince, so the less gullible are left wondering; and it is customary for discussions about this matter to terminate on a scale of pessimistic head-wagging, a shrug of the shoulders, and vague references to a pack of dogs wrangling over a bone, or to the peculiar tenacity of human nature which is said not to change.

As a part of my day-in-and-day-out job as a physician, I have had to observe people and to gain some understanding of the motivation of their behavior. I should like to present those observations, and to draw attention to the conclusions.

Phobia is a word used to refer to one of the commonest of the abnormal states. Phobia is taken to represent an unconscious wish, an emotion dissociated from a tabooed impulse, and attached to a harmless idea. While war cannot be said to be harmless, it is true that the traditional attitude toward war is one of glorification, and war is generally regarded as within the code of good morals, and therefore it is not tabooed, nor does it carry the stigma of harmful activities. Is it too much to assume that many political states suffer from the fear of closed places; that in reality whole nations are afflicted by an unconscious claustrophobia? It seems to me that there are many reasons to suppose that countries like Germany, Italy, and Japan are neurotic as a result of being restrained and limited within narrow borders, denied free access to wider territory, restricted in available raw materials, hampered in their aims, frustrated in their desires, crowded and hemmed in by unnatural barriers. This neurosis takes the form of what is called claustrophobia, and it represents an unconscious wish dissociated from a tabooed impulse—such as going anywhere in the world without let or hindrance—and attached to the harmless idea of war which always takes the form of defensive acts in the eyes of the combatants on both sides.

I do not suppose that this is at all a new idea. Perhaps it is the usual conception. But if the latter is true, it is surprising that it is given so little attention in international relations. It is strange that we do not apply our knowledge of individuals to our treatment of groups of people. There cannot be anything in a group that does not exist in some of the components of that group. The only difference is that the occult interactions of the group mind can magnify the extent of individual thought and feelings. So if a few persons become afflicted with a claustrophobia, it is entirely possible that the whole group may become so afflicted, and that the effect may be greater by reason of the group magnification. It seems to me that this conception of the explanation for the group behavior of states may not be generally understood. Certainly the aspect of civilization which appears to lag behind in the onward march of progress is the understanding of man. The achievements in the physical world, in material conquests, are on the grand scale, startling and stupendous. Man, about whom these things revolve, remains an enigma in many important aspects. The fairly sudden access to the secrets of nature, the wonderful advance in communication, in rapidity of travel, and the availability of the material components of food, clothing and shelter, all affect man in the highest degree, the results of which in many cases are probably unpredictable—and they surely are if efforts to understand man are not seriously undertaken. It is on this basis that it seems prudent and sensible for us to apply the little we know about man to man in the mass.

It is probable that the best understanding of man as a combined physical, mental, and emotional being may be found amongst the members of the medical profession. The general lack of such understanding in the public results either from the ignorance of medical men, or from their peculiar inarticulateness. I favor the latter explanation. I am quite sure that many medical men know enough about human beings—slight though it is—so that properly presented to the public it would constitute a pretty solid foundation upon which to base national and international programs. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss one small aspect of this huge subject, and to relate it to certain international problems immediately confronting the world. In order to be clear and concise, we will take the case of Japan and ask ourselves why she behaves as she does; why invade Manchukuo, terrorize China, defy the League of Nations, penetrate the Philippine Islands, and feverishly extend her industrial activities?

In the light of what I understand about the individual attributes of human beings, I should immediately conclude that Japan is suffering from a phobia, that her people are neurotic, and their behavior is the result of this phobia. Here we find a virile, homogeneous people restricted to a very small and segregated area—a people lately come to maturity and eager to express itself in the customary manner of dominant nations. At the same time the Japanese find themselves without adequate land space, lacking many essential raw materials, and frowned upon by the more established countries. They are aware of the assumption by the white people that yellow people are of an inferior order, and, if they had been unable to sense this before, they could not have missed the point of our discrimination against them in the immigration quotas.

Thus we have on the one hand a virile, aggressive, and ambitious people, and, on the other hand, a people

hemmed in by the sea, lacking land, raw materials, and space for expansion. At the same time they are made to feel the disapproval of a great portion of the further advanced nations. Under such conditions, a single human being would be likely to develop a neurosis. In the case of Japan it may well be that the unconscious wish to escape from the imprisoning confines of her narrow little group of islands has been transferred to the harmless idea (generally so considered) of military aggression. That is to say, her impulse to come and go in the world, to trade, to colonize, to explore for and develop raw materials has been tabooed by nations which had accomplished these purposes for themselves long before Japan had developed such an impulse. Thus we have a perfect example of the phobia as defined: an unconscious wish dissociated from a tabooed impulse and attached to a harmless idea. This phobia originating in the minds of a few powerful persons has permeated the group mind until large masses of people are involved. In this way countless peace-loving, tranquil people are converted into desperate men of action, bent on war.

If such an explanation constitutes the reason for a substantial factor in the cause of war, then it is apparent that one method of preventing wars is within our grasp. It ought to be possible for determined leaders to make international arrangements that would remove the basic conditions that lead to war and disaster.

Necessity of an American-Japanese Understanding for Peace in the Pacific

TARAKNATH DAS

Lord Beaverbrook in his article "A Military Alliance with England," published in the *American Mercury* of August, 1936, suggests that an Anglo-American alliance against Japan is the safest way to preserve American interests and peace in the Pacific. He further asserts that "so far as the Pacific is concerned, then, it seems that the United States carries heavier liabilities than the British Empire." (p. 434.) He, following the recommendations of British naval experts like Captain Bywater and others, advocates the policy of Anglo-American naval co-operation against Japan. Lest I be misunderstood, I quote the following:

> "If there were closer relations between the two nations, if there were an understanding, Britain would not come empty-handed into the association. Indeed, it is obvious that she would contribute something of the highest value to the United States, an understanding to protect the Atlantic seaboard of your country with her fleet. If America could concentrate her whole navy in the Pacific with the knowledge that her front doors were barred and bolted by battleships flying the British flag, that would be a matter of great comfort to the American people in a moment of stress. And Britain has the resources, the ships and the naval stations to confer this benefit." (p. 434.)

It is generous of Lord Beaverbrook to suggest that Great Britain would be willing to protect American Eastern shores, but it must not be forgotten that in the case of any trouble in Europe, Asia, or Africa, in which Great Britain may be easily involved, the British fleet will not be able to protect American interests in the Atlantic, but America may be called upon to assist Britain as was the case during the World War. Then it is conceivable that an Anglo-American military alliance may become a serious liability to the United States.

We do not agree with Lord Beaverbrook that American liabilities in the Pacific are greater than those of Great Britain. Great Britain has at least five times more financial interests in China than those of the United States. Great Britain's trade in China and other Asiatic countries, including India, as well as Australia, is menaced by the expansion of Japanese trade in general, and textile trade in particular. If Great Britain, in spite of serious economic and political rivalry with Japan, can maintain peace with the latter, why is it that British statesmen think that the United States may have a war with Japan when the U. S. Department of Commerce reports show that American-Japanese trade is flourishing, trade balance is in favor of the United States, and Japan is anxious to co-operate with the United States in developing Manchukuo? Is it because many British statesmen of the type of Lord Beaverbrook think that Japan is a potential menace to British imperial interests in the Pacific, and, following the usual practice of British diplomacy, they want the United States to pull the British chestnut from the fire by fighting Japan? Lord Beaverbrook's suggestion that the Japanese may attack the Pacific Coast of the United States for colonization purposes is simply mischievous.

Lord Beaverbrook's suggestion that America should concentrate her navy in the Pacific and utilize British support, including her naval bases, against Japan, confirms Japanese suspicion that in future eventualities Japan must increase her naval power against possible Anglo-American co-operation. America has considerable interest in the Pacific, and American-Japanese economic and commercial interests are supplementary to each other. Whereas, from international, economic, and commercial points of view, British economic policies, including discriminatory Imperial Preference, are opposed to American commerce all over the British Empire.

Peace in the Pacific can be best maintained, so far as the United States is concerned, by following the policy of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, who advocated an Anglo-American-Japanese understanding of some form to preserve the mutual interests of those great powers. No American statesman ever thinks of a future Anglo-American war, in spite of Britain's unfair and discriminatory policies against American commerce in India and other parts of the British Empire where the policy of Imperial Preference is applied. Is it not more desirable then for the United States to follow a policy of Anglo-American-Japanese understanding or preferably of American-Japanese understanding, instead of an Anglo-American military alliance against Japan?

So far as I understand the forces of world politics, I am convinced that an Anglo-American military and naval alliance to coerce Japan and force her to give up her position of predominance in the Far East may not insure peace, but foment war, whereas recognition of Japan's predominant position in the Far East and a peaceful understanding between the United States and Japan are the only effective means for peace in the Pacific. As a starting point for improving American-Japanese relations, one may expect that Secretary Hull would, in the near future, adopt measures for a new

commercial treaty between Japan and the United States based upon the ideal of reciprocity. Second, it is to be expected that following the "good neighbor" policy of President Roosevelt, steps would be taken for the conclusion of an American-Japanese Arbitration Treaty, based upon the principles of the so-called Bryan Peace Treaties.

It is my firm conviction that the conclusion of an Anglo-French Entente against a dominant Germany was one of the remote causes of the World War. Similarly an Anglo-American military alliance against Japan, as suggested by Lord Beaverbrook, would ultimately foment war in the Pacific which may become a cause of a World War.

The Study Table

A Fighter for Peace

SELECTED WRITINGS OF LYDIA G. WENTWORTH. *Norwood, Mass.: The Norwood Press. $1.50.*

This volume is a compilation of selected writings chiefly in the interest of world peace. It has three sections: A brief biography of the author; articles and letters to the press; letters selected from a voluminous correspondence, including some from such noted peace advocates as Lord Ponsonby, Emily Balch, Alice Park, Fanny Garrison Villard, Fanny Bixby Spencer, the Reverend Sydney Strong, et al.

The author has attained somewhat more than the allotted three score and ten years and can, perhaps, be said to be a pioneer in the world peace movement. While still a young child at the close of our Civil War, she recognized that war was an evil and an anomaly, and too unjust to be tolerated by thinking people.

During the World War she became imbued with a desire to draw public attention more clearly to the barbarity of warfare, and not only to its cruelty but to its stupidity as well. Thus it was that she began writing letters to the press all over the United States, as well as articles for papers and magazines both in this country and other English-speaking lands.

The author is an uncompromising fighter for peace. Righteous indignation against the atrocity and folly of warfare flames forth on page after page. Arguments are marshalled to show that war is never inevitable, but that it is perpetuated through the attitude of mind of those in power, an attitude due to false education as to the efficacy of force. The stand taken by Darwin that development and progress of humanity are due to the moral law as the basis of social intercourse is repeatedly stressed. With determined purpose the arguments favoring militarism and war, all mouldy from antiquity, are relentlessly tracked down and shattered, while pacifism and disarmament are upheld by reason and logic. That warfare is un-Christian and inhuman is not dwelt upon so much as the fact that it is imbecile—the product of ignorance, unreason, and immorality.

This book provides an illuminating example of what one person can do in a comparatively few years to influence public opinion. These letters and articles to editors of periodicals have done much to awaken an indifferent public to the futility of war and to the fact that, by the united effort of an informed and determined populace, war can be outlawed.

To all interested in abolishing war, we recommend this book as an invaluable collection of peace arguments. It is attractive as to format and binding.

JESSIE ROWE RYBURN.

Correspondence

Militant Braggadocios

Editor of UNITY:

Once a dictator, always a dictator. Dictatorships are conceived in force, established and maintained by force, and grow by what they feed on. Witness the furious outburst of Mussolini, August 30th. It is as appalling as it is sickening. Let me quote from it:

"With the most crushing of victories *in one of the most just wars,* Italy, with war in Africa, has acquired an immense, rich, imperial territory. . . . . For this reason, but not only for this reason, will *we reject the absurdity of eternal peace,* which is foreign to our creed and our temperament." Mussolini gives us this climax: "It is the spirit of the Black Shirt Revolution, the spirit of this Italy, the spirit of this populous Italy, *warlike and vigilant,* on sea, on land, and in the heavens."

And this from a dictator and to a people devoted to the life and teachings of Jesus!

I write to express my horror and condemnation of these barbarous fulminations from one of the absolute rulers in Europe. For if Mussolini does not mean what he says, he is not only an egocentric hypocrite, but a dangerous inciter to immediate war, that is, to the destruction of European civilization. But, indeed, he speaks the language of a dictator, one who knows he must ever keep before the eyes of his subjects the imperative need of a dictator.

Mussolini is not alone in this planned orgy of madness; he is merely its latest contemporary expositor. Having ravaged and conquered a backward country, he uses it as a glorified reason for the mobilization over night of 8,000,000 Italian soldiers for greater imperialistic ventures to come. This modern Nero befuddles while Madrid burns. Is civilization at the mercy of militant braggadocios?

S. O. LEVINSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

Unity and Miss Wentworth

Editor of UNITY:

It is through Miss Lydia Wentworth that I became acquainted with UNITY which I now consider one of the finest magazines I know. Some day I may write you more fully upon that topic and my changed attitude toward religion and life in general during the last comparatively few years, and the part Miss Wentworth and UNITY have had in that change.

Dayton, Ohio. R.

[*Editor's Note.*—Miss Wentworth is one of our oldest and most devoted friends. An invalid, she is one of the most active and effective pacifists we know.—J. H. H.]

(*Continued on page* 100)

Correspondence

(*Continued from page* 99)

Peace Poem Contest

Editor of UNITY:

May we ask the courtesy of early space in your correspondence columns in which to report to your readers that, as part of its campaign in behalf of world understanding and brotherhood, the Western Poetry League is conducting a Peace Poem Contest in its official magazine HORIZONS?

A cash prize of ten dollars, which it is hoped can be increased through donations, and several works of art will be awarded for hitherto unpublished poems most effectively pleading the cause of world peace. The winning poems and many of the other entries will appear in the winter issue of HORIZONS—the western, all-poetry magazine—which will be devoted solely to peace and given wide distribution.

Poems should be sent anonymously to HORIZONS, 6308 Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, California, prior to midnight, December 1, 1936, and should be marked "Peace Poem Contest." No poems will be returned. Accompanying sealed envelope should bear the name and address of the poet inside and the name of the poem outside. Any poet may submit any number of poems. Copies of poems submitted should be kept, as we shall enter no correspondence about submissions and positively no poems will be returned.

We wish to thank you for your news item concerning our "Poet's Peace Pledge" and we hope to hear from some of your readers.

Yours in the cause of peace,
WESTERN POETRY LEAGUE,
Lucia Trent,
Ralph Cheyney,
Directing Editors.

Los Angeles, California.

Wanted: Quotation from G. K. Chesterton

EDITOR OF UNITY:

A few years ago there was published in UNITY a quotation from G. K. Chesterton: a parable using the figure of a certain street light which different groups of people condemned for various reasons or for no good reason whatever and with such persistence that the light was finally destroyed—"and then there was war—war in the darkness." I have lost the copy and do not remember the date. Where can I find the quotation? I am not at all familiar with G. K. Chesterton's writing and would not know where to look.

J. W. WHITFORD.

Stow, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 82)

III. Economic Adjustments

Easing of international tensions through reciprocal trade agreements including all nations and through calling international conferences to consider stabilization of currency and the problem of facilitating access to raw materials and markets for all nations.

(A) The policy underlying reciprocal trade agreements attacks the evils of economic nationalism and high tariff barriers which close trade channels.

(B) Countries must be assured of access to raw materials and markets to provide for the welfare of their people. These changes must be made if a general war is to be avoided. The countries controlling the major portion of the world's economic resources must take the initiative in making these adjustments, so that less favored nations will not feel compelled to seek their necessities through war.

IV. Munitions

Taking the profits out of war and the preparation for war, and nationalizing the munitions industry.

Government control of munitions would lessen the incentive for constantly increasing armaments, and thus relieve the taxpayer. In case of war, private citizens would not be able to ship arms and munitions to warring nations and thus it would be easier for the United States to be neutral.

V. Conscription

Opposition to the enactment of any universal draft laws conscripting labor and all other man-power, as advocated in the Industrial Mobilization Plan.

This Industrial Mobilization Plan, proposed by the War and Navy Departments, provides for automatically drafting all male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45; for court martial in case any worker "fails or neglects to perform fully any duty required of him"; that the nature of the emergency may be such as to require employment of children under sixteen; for recruiting of women for "duty with the armed forces"; for establishing strict censorship of the press and controlling wages, hours of labor and working conditions.

The Mobilization Plan sets up an actively operating dictatorship under military control—which is essentially Fascism. There is no assurance that this control will be ended when the emergency is over.

VI. International Co-Operation

International co-operation for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the principles of the Kellogg Pact, including adherence to the World Court.

International anarchy must be replaced by international law. The United States should take an active part with other nations in developing legal and orderly procedure for settling international controversies.

This would include support of all peaceable forms of international co-operation, including the International Labor Office, the World Court, a reformed League of Nations, automatic arbitration, conciliation, conference, and mediation.

Supplementary

In addition to the foregoing immediate program for governmental action to prevent war, the Emergency Peace Campaign calls upon all those who love freedom and democracy to work for: (1) The preservation of all political and civil liberties; (2) the repeal of the Oriental Exclusion Act and extension of the quota system to immigrants without discrimination based on race; (3) legislation granting immigration authorities discretionary power to extend the right of asylum to aliens within this country and to political and religious refugees seeking entrance; (4) the elimination of armed force in industrial disputes, the enforcement of peonage laws and adequate state and federal anti-lynching legislation; (5) the abolition of compulsory military training in civilian educational institutions.

What Can You Do?

You must make your demands for peace known to those who represent you—to those who control your destiny by their vote!—*World Events.*